

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 9, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 2, 4, 9-13, 15-20 and 43-65 were previously pending in this application. Claims 10-11, 43, 49, 57-59, 61, and 63-65 are now amended. Claims 50 and 60 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 9-13, 15-20, 43-49, 51-59, and 61-65 are pending, with claims 43, 51, 57, 58, and 59 being independent. No new matter has been added.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 15-20 and 51-56 are allowed, and that claims 9, 49-50, and 60-65 would be allowable if re-written to include all the limitations of the claims from which they depend, including any intervening claims. Applicant has amended the claims based on these indications of allowable subject matter, and therefore believes all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 43 has been amended to substantially incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 50, which was indicated as allowable, and which depended directly from claim 43. Applicant believes the amendment places claim 43 in allowable condition.

For completeness, Applicant notes that the limitations of previous claim 50 are not incorporated verbatim into claim 43, because the terminology of claims 43 and 50 were slightly different. Therefore, while substantially incorporating the limitations of claim 50 into claim 43, Applicant also has amended claim 43 to more clearly state that the comparison of the display name of the second user is not necessarily to the display name of the first user, but rather the display name of the second user is compared to the display names in the contact store, which includes the first user. Applicant encourages the Examiner to review the language of amended claim 43 to ensure it is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 4, 9-13, and 44-49 depend from claim 43 and are therefore allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons. Some of these dependent claims have been amended to provide consistency with the amendments to claim 43.

Claim 51 and its dependent claims were indicated as allowed in the Office Action, and no amendments are made to these claims.

Independent claim 57 has been amended to substantially track the language of independent claim 43, except for the differing preambles. Thus, Applicant believes claim 57 is now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 58 has been amended to substantially track the language of independent claim 51, except for the differing preambles. Therefore, since claim 51 was indicated as allowed, Applicant believes claim 58 is also now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 59 is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Office Action indicated claim 60, which previously depended directly from independent claim 59, was allowable. Claim 59 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 60. Claims 61-65 depend from claim 59 and are therefore also allowable over the art of record. Some of these dependent claims have been amended to be consistent with claim 59 and to provide sufficient antecedent basis for all claim terms.

In sum, all of the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance based on the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter and the amendments now made. All of the dependent claims are allowable over the art based at least on their dependencies.

While Applicant has endeavored to amend the independent claims to substantially incorporate the limitations of dependent claims indicated as allowable, the Examiner is encouraged to review the language of the claims.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2, 4, 10-13, 43-48, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nyman et al. (US 2003/0037033). In view of the amendments made above, these rejections are now moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. M1103.70263US00.

Dated: August 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Thomas A. Franklin
Thomas A. Franklin
Registration No.: 63,456
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000